<div align="center">**Remarks**</div>

Claims 1-26, 31-56 and 61-73 are pending. Claims 1, 14, 31, 44, 61 and 67 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added in this Reply.

I.   **Rejections Over the Prior Art:**

In responding to the Examiner's prior art rejections, Applicant here only justifies the patentability of the independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 14, 31, 44, 61 & 67) and some dependent claims. As the Examiner will appreciate, should the independent claims be patentable over the prior art, narrower dependent claims would also necessarily be patentable. Accordingly, Applicant does not separately discuss the patentability of all the dependent claims, although it reserves the right to do so at a later time if necessary.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent Claims 1, 14, 31, 44, 61 & 67 have been rejected as allegedly being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Conference Composer User Guide ("CCUG") and U.S. Patent No. 5,966,532 to McDonald et al. ("McDonald"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Office Action articulates a single rejection of claims 1, 14, 31, 44, 61, and 67. This rejection is addressed here, with reference to claim 1.

The rejection of claim 1 over CCUG in view of McDonald is deficient because these references even if combined do not teach every element. The Examiner admits that CCUG "does not teach the configuration is performed by a setup program wherein the program facilitates selecting inputs, outputs and mapping parameters." Office Action dated 18 September, 2008. But, the Examiner asserts that McDonald discloses this limitation. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the "wizard" of McDonald facilitates configuration for the interface software, defines mapping parameters, and transfers mapping parameters to the interface software. The Examiner further alleges it would have been obvious to apply McDonald's teaching of executing a wizard in CCUG.

However, McDonald is silent as to the mapping of input and output parameters <u>relating to at least one of the selected audio inputs, audio outputs or audio conferencing devices</u> as recited in each independent claim. McDonald discloses "[a] computer-implemented system and method for ***automatically generating graphical code" [i.e., software that can later be edited]***.

McDonald at Abstract *emphasis added*. McDonald is directed to a graphical programming tool for facilitating the generation of source code. The "wizard" described in the cited sections of McDonald displays a configuration panel or dialog that prompts a user to select parameter values or functionality to configure certain aspects of graphical code. The output of McDonald would is source code, not mapping parameters relating to at least one of the selected audio inputs, audio outputs or audio conferencing devices. McDonald is silent as to configuring audio/video equipment that ahs physical inputs and outputs. Neither of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose how one of ordinary skill in the art would make the leap from the wizard that generates source code as taught in McDonald to mapping of input and output parameters relating to at least one of the selected audio inputs, audio outputs or audio conferencing devices as recited in each independent claim.,

The Office Action also refers to Fig. 6 of CCUG in rejecting elements (b)-(e). However, the Conference Composer program itself cannot meet elements (b)-(e) of claim 1 and thus itself is not a set up program, as recited in the claim. Elements (b)-(d) require selecting an audio input (element (b)), an audio output (element (c)), and an audio conferencing device (element (d)), each from the set up program. Conference Composer (and thus CCUG) does not provide an option for selecting an audio input or an audio output from the set up program. The inputs referenced in Figs. 6 and 7 of CCUG are not audio input devices that can be selected, but rather are the input ports of the audio conferencing device. Conference Composer allows the user to label these ports, "mic 1," "mic 2," etc., but does not allow a user to select a particular input to map to the input port of the conferencing device. Likewise, Conference Composer does not allow a user to select an output from the program, but only to label output ports with text labels.

Element (e) recites:

> (e) using the set up program to electronically map the inputs and
> outputs to input and output ports on the audio conference device;

Element (e) requires that the inputs that were selected from the set up program be electronically mapped to input ports of the audio conference device and that the outputs selected from the set up program be electronically mapped to output ports of the audio conference device. As mentioned above, Conference Composer only allows the user to select an audio conferencing device and then displays this device, as shown in Fig. 6. The inputs shown in Fig. 6 are the input ports of the selected audio conferencing device. These input ports are not populated by

electronically mapping selected audio inputs onto these ports, but rather, the ports are simply labeled with text. A user can associate a text label with an input port (for example, "mic 1"), but there is no provision for associating an actual input device with a given port.

In sum, CCUG does not teach elements (b)-(e). Rather, CCUG teaches selecting an audio conferencing device (Fig. 6) and using Conference Composer to map inputs of the audio conferencing device to outputs of the audio conferencing device. See sequence of Figs. 6-12 and related discussion pages 8-16 of CCUG. According to CCUG, a user selects an audio conferencing device (Fig. 6), types in text labels for the input ports (Fig. 7), and maps the signal flow from the input ports through the audio device to the output ports (Figs. 8-12).

Furthermore, CCUG either alone or if combined with McDonald, does not teach element (g) of claim 1, which recites:

> g) electronically transferring the mapping parameters to the user
> interface software

In rejecting elements (b)-(e) over CCUG, it must be assumed that Conference Composer is the set up program referenced in these elements. Assuming, *arguendo*, that this is the case, then Conference Composer alone or in combination with McDonald cannot meet claim limitation (g) because Conference Composer does not electronically transfer mapping parameters defined by Conferencing Composer (element (f)) to another program (i.e., to a user interface program) and McDonald simply generates graphical code requiring further attention by the user (*e.g.,* programmer). Actually, Conference Composer itself is the user interface software as recited in element (g) of claim 1 and CCUG simply does not teach a set up program as recited in elements (a)-(e). Thus, CCUG and McDonald cannot render claim 1 obvious because they do not teach every element of the claim.

Additionally, independent claims 14, 31, 44, 61, and 67 each include at least the selecting and mapping limitations discussed above and thus are not rendered obvious by CCUG in view of McDonald. All other claims are dependent claims which are necessarily patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons.

Regarding dependent claims 4, 17, 34, 47, 64 and 70 the Examiner asserts that CCUG as modified by McDonald discloses that step (d) is accomplished automatically by the setup program on the basis of the selected inputs and outputs and cites to page 8 of CCUG. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that all the inputs map to particular output, referencing page 8

of CCUG. However, nothing on page 8 of CCUG teaches that a conferencing device is automatically selected by the set up program based on the selected inputs and outputs. By the time a user reaches the steps described on page 8 in the CCUG, the user has already selected an audio conferencing device. See pages 6 and 7 of CCUG (describing installing a Vortex). Page 8 simply describes assigning Inputs and Outputs to the device, rather than selecting a device based on the inputs and outputs. Additionally, neither reference discloses all the limitations of the independent claims from which these claims depend and thus cannot render these claims obvious. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness as required by 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and Patent Office Procedure. MPEP 2142. Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Regarding dependent claims 6, 19, 36 and 49 the Examiner asserts that CCUG as modified by McDonald discloses displaying an error message if the selected audio conference device is not compatible with the selected inputs and outputs and cites to page 9 of CCUG and McDonald Col. 14 lines 44-63. However, nothing on page 9 of CCUG allows for selecting inputs or outputs or displaying an error message and McDonald has nothing at all to do with selecting an audio conference device. The message disclosed at the cited portion of McDonald is to "remind the user that the control is associated with *wizard generated code.*" McDonald at Col. 14 lns 54-55. It is obvious that this is wholly different from what is recited in these dependent claims regarding validating compatibility of devices and input/outputs. Furthermore, McDonald discloses generating source code and has nothing to do with selecting an audio conference device. Additionally, neither reference discloses all the limitations of the independent claims from which these claims depend and thus cannot render these claims obvious. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness as required by 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and Patent Office Procedure. MPEP 2142. Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Regarding dependent claims 7, 20, 37, 50, 65 and 71 the Examiner asserts that CCUG as modified by McDonald discloses step (e) is accomplished automatically by the setup program. The Examiner states "the Signal Activity LEDs mapped to the inputs and outputs of the System Page" from page 8 and cites McDonald Col. 10, lines 24-57. However, the LEDs mentioned on page 8 are not configured via a setup program. However, all that the cited section of CCUG states is that Signal LED's that are mapped to the inputs and outputs show signal activity and

indicate when the input or output has signal level above the Activity Threshold. CCUG does not say that the mapping is accomplished automatically by a set up program. The cited portion of McDonald has nothing at all to do with an audio conference device. The cited portion of McDonald discloses and explains a flowchart for "automatically generating graphical code in a graphical programming system." McDonald at Col. 10 lns 25-29. It is obvious that this is wholly different from what is recited in these dependent claims. Additionally, neither reference discloses all the limitations of the independent claims from which these claims depend and thus cannot render these claims obvious. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness as required by 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and Patent Office Procedure. MPEP 2142. Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Regarding dependent claims 11, 24, 41 and 54 the Examiner asserts that CCUG as modified by McDonald discloses that the setup program is executed upon execution of the user interface software. The Examiner cites to McDonald at Abstract, Col. 4 lines 42-67 and Col. 5 lines 1-22. After reviewing the cited portions of McDonald it is clear that the wizard in McDonald is always invoked by a user who wants to edit graphical code and is not executed upon execution of some other software program. Additionally, neither reference discloses all the limitations of the independent claims from which these claims depend and thus cannot render these claims obvious. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness as required by 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and Patent Office Procedure. MPEP 2142. Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Regarding dependent claims 25, 55 and 73 the Examiner asserts that CCUG as modified by McDonald discloses the predetermined sequential series of steps comprises a predetermined sequential series of screens and cites to page 2 of CCUG. However, page 2 of CCUG clearly calls for executing a single installation program to install a software application, whereas each of claims 25, 55 and 73 call for an interaction between two already installed programs (*i.e.*, user interface software) and another program (*i.e.*, setup program). Additionally, neither reference discloses all the limitations of the independent claims from which these claims depend and thus cannot render these claims obvious. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness as required by 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and Patent Office Procedure. MPEP 2142. Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

Claims 2-3, 5, 15-16, 18, 32-33, 35, 45-46, 48, 62-63, and 68-69 have been rejected as allegedly being obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by CCUG in view of McDonald and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0260416 to Kellom et al. ("Kellom"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner admits that CCUG as modified by McDonald does not teach using the setup program to define audio optimization parameters for the inputs or outputs and transferring the audio optimization parameters to the user interface software. The Examiner asserts that Kellom discloses this limitation.

Kellom is directed to "[a]n audio amplifier [that] includes a local interface system and an audio processing system. The local interface system may include a panel mounted display and a user input device. The local interface system may be used to locally configure and control the audio amplifier." Kellom at Abstract. As discussed above, neither CCUG nor McDonald, either alone or together, disclose a setup program and transferring audio optimization parameters to another program (*i.e.,* user interface software) and Kellom does not disclose this limitation either. Kellom is simply a panel attached directly to an audio amplifier to configure and control the audio amplifier. Thus, the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness as required by 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and Patent Office Procedure. MPEP 2142. Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw these rejections.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are allowable. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested at the earliest possible date.

Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

<div align="center">**********</div>

Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (832)446-2445.

Respectfully submitted,

/William M. Hubbard/
William M. Hubbard, Reg. No. 59,835

WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,
 RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P.
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77070
832-446-2400 phone
832-446-2424 fax